



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,415	07/13/2001	Travis W. Loyd	10010635-1	4730

7590 12/14/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/905,415	LOYD, TRAVIS W.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brandon S. Hoffman	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are pending in this office action.
2. Applicant's arguments, filed October 17, 2005, have been considered and are persuasive. However, a new ground of rejection is made.

Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-10, 12-20, and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linsker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,680,455) in view of Weller (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0080959).

Regarding claims 1, 12, and 22, Linsker et al. teaches a method/system/printer for regulating the ability of a user to print on a printer, comprising:

- A sending processor that includes a private key of a sender, where the private key forms a key pair with a public key, the sending processor being adapted to encrypt an aspect of a print job using the private key and to send the print job and encrypted aspect over a network (col. 4, lines 43-58); and

- A printer in communication with the sending processor, where the printer is adapted to receive the print job and encrypted aspect from the sending processor and to verify the sender by decoding the encrypted aspect using the public key (col. 4, line 66 through col. 5, line 50).

Linsker et al. does not teach to print a document based on the print job only if the aspect of the print job is decoded successfully.

Weller teaches to print a document based on the print job only if the aspect of the print job is decoded successfully (paragraph 0032).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine only printing if the aspect of the print job is decoded successfully, as taught by Weller, with the method/system/printer of Linsker et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because preventing printing until an aspect of the print job is decoded successfully proves that the sender really sent the document that they said they sent.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 13, and 23, Linsker et al. as modified by Weller teaches where the printer is located at a printing site and the sender is verified upon a demonstration that the sender possesses the private key at the printing site (see col. 5, lines 41-50 of Linsker).

Regarding claims 4, 14, and 24, Linsker et al. as modified by Weller teaches where the private key is stored on a portable processor and possession is demonstrated with a locally-restricted optical signal (see fig. 2, ref. num 208 of Linsker).

Regarding claims 5, 15, and 25, Linsker et al. as modified by Weller teaches where the aspect relates to content of the print job (see col. 4, lines 55-58 of Linsker).

Regarding claims 6, 16, and 26, Linsker et al. as modified by Weller teaches where the aspect, after encryption, is a digital signature (see col. 4, lines 45-49 of Linsker).

Regarding claims 7, 17, and 27, Linsker et al. as modified by Weller teaches where the public key is included in a digital certificate (see col. 5, lines 7-19 of Linsker).

Regarding claims 8, 18, and 28, Linsker et al. as modified by Weller teaches where the public key is included in the print job (see col. 4, lines 55-58 of Linsker).

Regarding claims 9, 19, and 29, Linsker et al. as modified by Weller teaches where the public key is obtained by the printer from a public key database (see col. 5, lines 3-7 of Linsker).

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Linsker et al. as modified by Weller teaches where the public key is linked to an authorization table that permits the sender to print on the printer (see col. 8, lines 10-12 of Linsker).

Claims 11, 21, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linsker et al. (USPN '455) in view of Weller (US PG PUB 2002/0080959), and further in view of Pravetz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,684).

Regarding claims 11 and 21, Linsker et al. as modified by Weller teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 12, respectively, above. However, Linsker et al. as modified by Weller does not teach where the print job is at least partially encrypted by the sender with a public key of the printer.

Pravetz et al. teaches where the print job is at least partially encrypted by the sender with a public key of the printer (col. 4, line 63 through col. 5, line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine encrypting the print job by the sender with a public key of the printer, as taught by Pravetz et al., with the method/system of Linsker et al./Weller. It would have been obvious for such modifications because this allows only the printer to be able to decrypt the print job with its own private key.

Regarding claim 30, Linsker et al. teaches a method for regulating the ability of a user to print on a printer, comprising the steps of:

- Receiving, at a printer, a print job from a user, where the print job includes a representation of a document and an aspect of the print job that is encrypted with a private key of the user (col. 4, lines 42-58);
- Verifying the user by decoding the aspect using a public key of the user, where the public key and the private key form a key pair (col. 5, lines 26-40).

Linsker et al. does not teach determining, in a process distinct from verifying, if the user with the private key has permission to print and printing the document on the printer only if the **aspect is decoded successfully and the user has permission to print**.

Pravetz et al. teaches determining, in a process distinct from verifying, if the user with the private key has permission to print (fig. 6 and col. 5, lines 9-16) and the user is a verified user and has permission to print (fig. 10B, ref. num 1012/1013).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine determining if the user with the private key has permission to print and printing the document on the printer when the user has permission to print, as taught by Pravetz et al., with the method of Linsker et al. It would

have been obvious for such modifications because determining permissions and verifying users provides secured access to a document (see abstract of Pravetz et al.).

The combination of Linsker as modified by Pravetz et al. still does not teach printing the document on the printer only if the **aspect is decoded successfully**.

Weller teaches printing the document on the printer only if the **aspect is decoded successfully** (paragraph 0032).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine only printing if the aspect of the print job is decoded successfully, as taught by Weller, with the method of Linsker et al./Pravetz et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because preventing printing until an aspect of the print job is decoded successfully proves that the sender really sent the document that they said they sent.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon S. Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Branda Alp

BH

CEL
Primary Examiner
AU431
12/11/05